

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-13 are pending and stand rejected.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,617 (Bird). Applicants disagree because Bird does not disclose all the elements recited in Applicants' claims and does not motivate one of skill in the art to make Applicants' invention.

Applicants' claims recite a user input device that uses a co-planar array of light-sensitive devices to sense light emitted by a stylus. The stylus emits a light beam that has, "a cross-sectional profile having a known shape characterized by an intensity variance across the beam profile." The input device further includes, "electronics coupled to the light-sensitive devices and configured to determine the position of the light beam to within a spacing that is less the maximum distance," where the maximum distance is the center-to-center spacing of nearest adjacent light-sensitive devices in the array. Bird does not teach or suggest using a beam profile having a known intensity variance that can be used to determine the position of the light beam to an accuracy that is better than the accuracy that would be afforded given the center-to-center spacing of the light-sensitive devices.

Bird discloses a light pen input system where the pen emits a beam of light that is non-circular in its cross-sectional shape so that the orientation of the pen can be determined. Bird does not disclose using a beam that has a known intensity variation across its profile, other than by having a non-circular shape. Even so, there is nothing in Bird to teach or suggest the use of a known variation in beam intensity profile to achieve an enhanced positional accuracy as claimed by Applicants.

For these reasons, Applicants' claims are patentable over Bird. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4 and 7-10 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bird in view of U.S. Publication 2004/0071066 (Valley). Applicants disagree.

Valley discloses determining emitter beam size in data storage applications. Valley does not relate in any way to user input devices, and adds nothing that would cure the deficiencies of the Bird reference. As such, the proposed combination of Valley with Bird cannot be used to state a prima facie case of obviousness for at least the reason that the proposed combination does

not disclose all the recited elements in Applicants' claims. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 5 and 6 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bird in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,133,906 (Geaghan). Applicants disagree.

Geaghan discloses a stylus input system that utilizes the display electrodes as part of the positioning circuit. The input system of Geaghan is capacitive/inductive. Geaghan does not pertain to light-emitting stylus detection systems. Geaghan therefore adds nothing that would cure the deficiencies of the Bird reference. As such, the proposed combination of Geaghan with Bird cannot be used to state a prima facie case of obviousness for at least the reason that the proposed combination does not disclose all the recited elements in Applicants' claims. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2 and 11-13 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-13 are in condition for allowance and request early indication of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

27 Nov. 2006  
Date

By: Robert J. Pechman  
Robert J. Pechman, Reg. No.: 45,002  
Telephone No.: 651-737-0631

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833